

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections of the application.

#### Specification:

The Examiner is thanked for the reminder of the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended to remove the word "means".

#### Art Rejection:

Claims 1-10 have been again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,305,496, hereinafter *Gagnon et al.* The Examiner alleges that the embodiment of *Gagnon* illustrated in Figures 5 and 6 corresponds to the present invention. However, the present invention, and in particular, as set forth in claims 1-10, is significantly different from *Gagnon*. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, the independent claims are amended to further distinguish the invention from the applied prior art.

Specifically, *Gagnon* discloses a shock and vibration isolating caster wherein torsion elements 70 are provided between plates 72 and wheel support plates 68 in order to provide limited torsion between the wheel support plate 68 and the fixed plates 72. As can be seen in the specification and drawings, the wheels 62 are mounted on a live *central* axle 64 which rotates about *central* axis 65. The axle 64 is secured in a hole extending through the support plates 68 and provided with a

bearing to enable the axle 64 to rotate within the support plate 68. Both the mounting plates 72 and the torsion disks 70 have a slot 76 formed therein which can be seen in Figure 6. Accordingly, in *Gagnon*, the axle 64 is not connected to the plate 72, but passes through an arcuate slot 76 formed in the plate. In addition, the axle 64 in *Gagnon* forms the carrying axis of the wheel.

The Examiner alleges that the wheel support plates 68 of *Gagnon* correspond to the claimed hub body, the mounting plates 72 of *Gagnon* correspond to the claimed wheel mount, the axle 64 of *Gagnon* corresponds to the claimed supporting axle, and the axis 65 of *Gagnon* corresponds to the claimed carrying axis.

According to amended claim 1, the supporting axle is spaced from the central wheel axis, whereas in *Gagnon*, the Examiner alleges that the axle 64 corresponds to claimed supporting axle. The axle 64 is clearly mounted along the central carrying axis 65 of the wheel. Accordingly, at least this portion of claim 1 is clearly not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.

Similar arguments apply to claim 10, wherein claim 10 indicates that the supporting axle is provided on the wheel mount and extends through the bore of the hub body so as to support the hub body and wheel, and further that the supporting axle is spaced from a central axis of the wheel. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, these features of claim 10 are also not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.


Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 22, 2005

By:   
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620